

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/693,329
Attorney Docket: 46675-0005
Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 12, 2006 wherein the Examiner:

- (i) rejected to claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stanton (U.S. Patent No. 6,196,699);
- (ii) rejected claims 1, 4, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bladowski (prior art previously cited);
- (iii) rejected claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Chuang (prior art previously cited);
- (iv) rejected claims 1-3, 39, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Williams (U.S. Patent No. 2,686,866);
- (v) rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Stanton;
- (vi) rejected claims 4, 6, 40, 41, 48 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Williams;
- (vii) rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladowski;
- (viii) rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladowski and Chuang in view of Smith et al. (prior art previously cited);
- (ix) rejected claims 10, 42 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams; and
- (x) objected to claims 12, 43-45 and 51-53 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Final Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/693,329
Attorney Docket: 46675-0005
Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2006

responsive to the Final Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Applicants reiterate that the claims as presented in their February 21, 2006 Amendment and Response are allowable over the prior art. Nonetheless, Applicants have rewritten claims 12, 43-45 and 51-53 to be in independent form, and have amended all remaining claims to depend from these allowable independent claims in order to obtain a Notice of Allowance. Therefore, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this Application.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7570.

Applicant believes there are no fees due for this document, however, if any fees are due, the Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

U.S. Application Serial No. 10/693,329
Attorney Docket: 46675-0005
Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2006

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Date: August 11, 2006

By: 

Michael A. Schaldenbrand
Reg. No. 47,923

Dickinson Wright PLLC
1901 L Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
(248) 433-7570

MAS/

BLOOMFIELD 46675-5 766116v1